DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 521 CE 053 760

AUTHOR Fleischman, Howard L.; Willette, JoAnne
TITLE An Analysis of Vocational Training Needs and Services for Limited English Proficient Adults.
INSTITUTION Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Assessment of Vocational Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 88
CONTRACT 300-87-0123
NOTE 41p.; For related documents, see ED 283 020, ED 290 881, ED 299 412, ED 297 150, CE 053 752-774, and CE 053 783-797.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Adult Basic Education; *Adult Vocational Education; *Bilingual Education Programs; Case Studies; Disadvantaged; English (Second Language); *Labor Force Development; Language Proficiency; *Limited English Speaking; Social Services
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; California; Carl D Perkins Vocational Education Act 1984; Florida; Illinois; New York; Texas

ABSTRACT

This document presents the major findings from a study of vocational training and other employment-related services for adults and out-of-school youth with limited English proficiency (LEP). An introduction describes the study and its purposes. Chapter 2 presents estimates and projections of the LEP population to the year 2000 and describes this group in terms of their English proficiency, race/ethnicity, age, education, year of immigration, geographic distribution and urbanicity, labor force status, income and earnings, type of household, and whether or not they are native born. Chapter 3 describes models of vocational training, addressing the language, vocational, and support services components. Chapter 4 presents the findings from six case studies conducted to examine services and policies concerning the provision of services to LEP adults in Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas. Chapter 5 offers conclusions and recommendations regarding the federal role, services needed, populations and geographic areas to target, the distribution of funds, and eligibility for services. (CML)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315521

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AN ANALYSIS OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING NEEDS AND SERVICES FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS

Howard L. Fleischman and JoAnne Willette

Development Associates, Inc.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, VA 22204

Submitted to:

National Assessment of Vocational Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

November 1988

CE053760

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This document was prepared under Contract No. 300-87-0123 with the U.S. Department of Education. The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the Department, and no official endorsement by the Department of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Estimates and Projections of the LEP Adult Population	3
III.	Models of Vocational Training	14
IV.	State and Local Policies and Services	23
V.	Conclusions and Recommendations	27

I. INTRODUCTION

Limited English proficient (LEP) adults make up a significant percentage of our nation's population, and the numbers of such individuals are growing as new immigrants and refugees enter the country. In addition to their limited English language ability, these individuals often lack the occupational skills necessary to obtain suitable employment to provide for themselves and their families. An important challenge to our nation is how to integrate these individuals into the mainstream society and help them achieve self-sufficiency so they can become productive contributors to the nation's economy.

This document brings together the major findings from a study of vocational training and other employment-related services for LEP adults and out-of-school youth. The study was part of the National Assessment of Vocational Education, mandated by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 and carried out within the U.S. Department of Education. The study's goals were to estimate the size of the LEP adult population and those in need of vocational training and employment related services; to determine the extent to which vocational training needs are being met; and to make recommendations for future federal policy concerning vocational services for LEP adults.

In carrying out the study, an analysis of 1980 U.S. Census data was undertaken to determine the number of LEP adults in the country and to make projections to the years 1990, 1995, and 2000. Using income data from the Census, estimates and projections were then made of the number of LEP adults in need of vocational training and employment related services. The results of these analyses are presented in detail in a report titled Estimates and Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population in Need of Employment Training.[1/] A summary of the major findings from that report is presented in Chapter II of this document.

1/ Willette, Jo Anne, Haub, Carl, and Tordella, Stephen. Estimates and Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population in Need of Employment Training. Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, VA. October 1988.

In addition to the analyses of Census data, case studies were prepared in six states which examined the types of vocational training and other employment-related services currently offered to LEP adults and out-of-school youth, as well as state and local policies which affect the provision of these services. In preparing the case studies, interviews were conducted with officials and staff at state-level agencies which administer vocational training programs and at similar agencies in two local jurisdictions (a large metropolitan area and a small city) within each of the states. State and local policy-makers and representatives of advocacy groups concerned with ethnic minorities which contain large numbers of LEP individuals were also interviewed.

From the case study data and a review of literature concerning vocational and language training for LEP adults, a framework for describing vocational services directed at that population group was developed. Vocational training approaches for LEP adults were described in a report titled Models of Vocational Training for Limited English Proficient Adults.[2/] A synopsis of that report is presented in Chapter III of this document.

The individual case studies which focus on services and policies are presented in a report titled Case Studies of Vocational Education Services and Policy for Limited English Proficient Adults[3/] A synthesis of the major findings across the six case studies are presented in Chapter IV.

Finally, Chapter V of this document presents recommendations for future policy concerning vocational services for LEP adults which have been derived from the study data.

2/ Fleischman, H.L. Models of Vocational Training for Limited English Proficient Adults. Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, VA. July 1988.

3/ Fleischman. H.L., Willette, J., Hanberry, G.C., and Hopstock, P.J. Case Studies of Vocational Education Services and Policy for Limited English Proficient Adults. Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, VA. November 1988.

II. ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION

A. Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to present estimates of the size of the limited English proficient adult and out-of-school youth population in need of vocational education and related employment services, and to present projections of the size of this population from the present to the year 2000.

B. Procedures

The procedures included a literature review, an analysis of 1980 Census data, and projections of the limited English proficient adult population and the population in need of employment training to the year 2000.

The 1980 Census PUMS C file, which is a one percent sample of the population, was chosen as the most appropriate database for the study. The population used in the analysis consisted of adults and out-of-school youth ages 16-64. Five major racial/ethnic categories were used to describe the population: White non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Asian, Hispanic, and other non-Hispanic. The Hispanic population was further categorized into Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other Hispanic. The Asian category included Pacific Islanders.

Two measures were constructed from census data to assist in the analysis. The first was a measure of language proficiency. This measure was used to categorize persons either as limited English proficient or as English proficient based on responses to a language usage question in the 1980 Census. The other measure categorized individuals by poverty status as follows:

- Below 1.25 times the poverty level;
- 1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level; and
- 2.00 or more times the poverty level.

With the poverty level set at 1.00, 1.25 is 125 percent of the poverty level and 1.99 is 199 percent of the poverty level, etc. The family income for persons at 1.24 times the poverty level was less than half the median family income for the total U.S. population in 1979. Those at and below this level exist in poor economic conditions. Those at 1.99 times the poverty level had a family income of less than three-quarters of the national median family income in 1979 and may be thought of as living at the lower end of the middle class. Consequently, the majority of persons living between 1.25 and 1.99 would be fairly poor and any downturn in the economy or personal circumstances could jeopardize their minimal economic well-being.

C. Study Findings

Study findings, including the literature review, the analysis of the 1980 Census data, and projections to the year 2000, are summarized below.

1. Trends in Immigration

The size of the immigrant flow has grown steadily since 1965 until it is almost as high as it was in the 1900s. Many of the most recent immigrants are less educated and less skilled than those who entered the country 15 to 20 years ago.

2. Estimates of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population from the 1980 Census

Using a measure of English proficiency derived from the census, the number of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, was estimated to be 6.8 million in 1980. Of these, 56 percent were Hispanic, 27 percent were White non-Hispanic, 13 percent were Asian, 2 percent were Black non-Hispanic, and 2 percent were Other non-Hispanic. The limited English proficient adult population was about 4 percent of the total U.S. population, ages 16-64, in 1980.

3. Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population to the Year 2000

The number of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, is projected to be about 11.6 million by 1990 and about 17.4 million by 2000. This is a 156 percent increase in the limited English proficient adult population by the year 2000. The increase takes into account the cumulative effect of annual net migration from 1980 to 2000,. It does not, however, account for those who become English proficient during this period.

The limited English proficient adult population will become increasingly Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander and less White European. The population will also be increasingly from developing countries. Currently, the highest proportion of limited English proficient adults are Hispanics, and this proportion will increase by the year 2000. There will continue to be a small but significant number of limited English proficient adults who are native born.

4. Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population in Need of Employment Training to the Year 2000

The number of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, who could require employment training and related services is projected to be about 5.5 million in 1990 and about 8.0 million in 2000. Persons in need of services are defined by their poverty status: (1) those below 1.25 times the poverty level who are considered "most at risk," and (2) those between 1.25 and 1.99 times the poverty level who are considered "potentially at risk." The "most at risk" limited English proficient adult population is projected to be about 3.3 million by 1990 and about 4.7 million by 2000. The "potentially at risk" population is expected to reach about 2.2 million by 1990 and about 3.3 million by 2000. These numbers do not take into account language assimilation or upward mobility.

5. Characteristics of Limited English Proficient Adults

Following is a summary of the characteristics of the limited English proficient adult population based on an analysis of the 1980 Census data, the literature review, and the projections.

a. English Proficiency

The native language or mother tongue of limited English proficient persons is, by definition, other than English. Over half (56 percent) of the limited English proficient adult population in the U.S. speak Spanish. The other limited English proficient adults speak a mix of Asian, European, and other languages.

The likelihood of becoming English proficient is greatest within ten years following immigration. Beyond this, the likelihood decreases. The Hispanic population, as a whole, both immigrants and native born, have higher rates of persons who are limited English proficient across all age groups compared to persons in other racial/ethnic categories.

Fluency in English is important for economic assimilation because it is the language of the U.S. labor force. English proficiency facilities integration into information networks, increases productivity, and increases the potential for geographic mobility. English fluency improves with the number of years of schooling in the United States. It continues to improve during the work years, but not as rapidly. Adults who receive all of their schooling prior to coming to this country are the least English proficient, but generally their English improves with time, if they are exposed to it enough and are not isolated in ethnic enclaves.

b. Race/Ethnicity and Spanish Origin

Over 70 percent of the limited English proficient adults living below 1.99 times the poverty level in the year 2000 will be Hispanics. Of

these Hispanics, the largest number will be of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin. An additional 19 percent of the low income limited English proficient adult population will be from various Asian countries, and a large proportion of these will be from the developing countries of southeast Asia. There will also be small numbers of Black non-Hispanic, White non-Hispanic, and Native American (including American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts) low income limited English proficient adults.

There are significant differences in the percentage of limited English proficient adults below 1.25 times the poverty level within each racial/ethnic category. Ranging from high to low, the percentages are: Persons in the "Other non-Hispanic" category, comprised mostly of Native Americans (50 percent); Puerto Rican (46 percent); Mexican (35 percent); Black non-Hispanic (30 percent); other Hispanic, comprised mostly of persons from Central and South America (28 percent); Asian (21 percent); Cuban (16 percent); and White non-Hispanic (15 percent).

c. Age

The largest number of poor limited English proficient persons is expected to be in the 16 to 25 year age range. Well over half of the limited English proficient adult population below 1.99 times the poverty level are expected to be in this age range. The concentration in the lower age ranges is partly due to the younger age structure of the population and partly the result of the relationship between age and income. Based on the research, however, large numbers of the limited English proficient population below 1.99 times the poverty level are not expected to have the upward occupational mobility associated with increased years in the U.S. that was demonstrated by earlier immigrants. The limited potential for upward mobility will be due, in part, to the relatively low median educational level of this population.

d. **Education**

In 1980, limited English proficient adults had a median educational level of 9.4 years, which is equivalent to completing the first year of high school. By comparison, English proficient adults had a median educational level of 12.1 years. Furthermore, educational level is associated with poverty. The number of limited English proficient adults who will not be high school graduates and will be living below 1.99 times the poverty level is projected to be 3,813,571 by 1990 and 5,716,476 by 2000.

A large number of the less educated will not only be English deficient but will also lack basic skills required to compete in the future job market. Based on current trends, many will be adults from developing countries or will be school drop-outs in this country, including large numbers of Mexican and Puerto Rican youth.

Better educated limited English proficient adults, who are literate in their own language, should assimilate more readily, depending on the extent to which they have relevant basic skills. They should be able to use written materials to learn a skill.

e. **Year of Immigration**

In 1980, about two-thirds of the limited English proficient adults were foreign born and less than half were citizens. Poverty appears to be associated with recency of immigration, with the more recent immigrants being the most likely to live in poverty.

f. **Geographic Distribution and Urbanicity**

Limited English proficient persons are highly concentrated in certain areas of the country, and this is expected to continue. Of the four Census regions of the United States, the West is expected to have 37 percent of the limited English proficient adult population under 1.99

times the poverty level by the year 2000. Most will be persons of Mexican origin and Asian origin in California. Twenty-eight percent will be in the South. A majority of these will be persons of Mexican origin in Texas. Florida will also have large numbers of low income limited English proficient adults. An additional 26 percent will live in the Northeast region, mostly in the New York City metropolitan area. A large percentage of these will be Puerto Rican, but there will also be persons from the other racial/ethnic populations as well. The Midwest is projected to have 9 percent of the low income limited English proficient adult population by the year 2000. They will be concentrated mostly in the Chicago metropolitan area, and a large percentage will be Hispanic.

The newer immigrants tend to arrive in a number of "gateway" cities and settle there, accounting for the fact that over half of the more recent arrivals are in the four states of California, New York, Texas, and Florida. Immigrants often settle in ethnic enclaves, and the less educated, less skilled limited English proficient population tends to concentrate in these enclaves. Newer immigrants are less likely than other residents to disperse geographically to take advantage of better job opportunities and higher wages in other areas of the country. Their English deficiency and lack of knowledge concerning the U.S. labor market may hamper their geographic mobility and, thus, their economic assimilation.

The majority of limited English proficient adults are in urban areas and do best economically in these areas. Many of those in rural areas are at greater risk of poverty. Migrant farmworkers and their children are a special case in point. A large number of farmworkers are limited English proficient, speaking only Spanish. Their median educational level is 7.7 years of school, and their children have very high dropout rates. A large number leave farmwork after five to fifteen years because of the grueling labor.

g. Labor Force Status

Immigrants with U.S.-specific human capital, in terms of language, education and skills, assimilate into the U.S. economy more readily than those without these attributes. The vast majority of the newer immigrants are from non-English speaking, less developed countries of Southeast Asia and Latin America. They must not only learn the language, but must also adjust to a different economic structure. A smaller proportion of the immigrants are from emerging or industrialized countries of Asia and Europe with similar economic structures. Even though language may be a problem initially, immigrants from these countries seem to do better economically than those from less developed countries.

Overall, non-English speaking immigrants do less well economically than their native born counterparts. Immigrants tend to be concentrated in low wage, low skill jobs, experience downward occupational mobility, or can only find part-time employment. Some withdraw from the labor force altogether. The economic cost of limited English proficiency is ethnically and occupationally specific. The negative effect of limited English proficiency is greatest in the skilled occupations, where wages are highest. In a study that compared foreign born and native born Asian and Hispanic men, foreign born Asians did better in all occupational categories than foreign born Hispanic men, possibly because the Asians find work in ethnic business enclaves where English is not as important. Except for the Cubans, Hispanics generally do not have access to ethnic business enclaves at the same rate.

h. Income and Earnings

Limited English proficient adults have lower incomes than English proficient adults, and females in both populations earn less than their male counterparts. Compared to English proficient males,

limited English proficient males earn 33 percent less, English proficient females earn 45 percent less, and limited English proficient females earn 58 percent less. Recent research indicates that newer immigrants are less likely than earlier immigrants to reach earnings parity with the native born population in their lifetime, primarily due to lack of U.S. specific human capital.

Limited English proficient adults are more than twice as likely as English proficient adults to live below 1.25 times the poverty level. Furthermore, almost half of the limited English proficient adults are below 1.99 times the poverty level compared to about a quarter of the English proficient adults.

Part of the wage differential between limited English and English proficient adults is a function of differences in hours worked. English proficient adults worked somewhat more hours in 1979 than limited English proficient adults, and males in both populations worked more hours than females. Limited English proficient adults living in poverty tend to work less than full-time.

Many immigrant families rely on multiple wage earners to improve family income and to reach self-sufficiency, and immigrant groups with two wage earners tend to have higher incomes. The low mean family income of Mexicans is partially due to the low labor force participation rate of Mexican females. This low rate may be associated with the high fertility rate for Mexican females, indicating possible family responsibilities that preclude employment.

The sources and amounts of family income vary among Hispanic ethnic groups. Puerto Ricans have the lowest family incomes, and Mexicans have the next lowest family incomes. Cubans and Central and South Americans have much higher family incomes than the Puerto Ricans or Mexicans, but not quite as high as White non-Hispanics.

Puerto Ricans also had the lowest earned income and the highest non-labor incomes (including transfer income) compared to the other Hispanics. This disparity between Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics

is possibly due to Puerto Ricans, on average, having low skills and being concentrated in a high skill labor market where transfer income is generous. A high percentage of Mexicans have low skills, but they tend to be concentrated in low wage areas, which may make it easier to obtain employment. Cubans and South and Central Americans are more likely to have earnings from wives and female family heads than the other Hispanics. Their mean family incomes are somewhat less than those of White non-Hispanics primarily due to the lower earnings of male family heads.

The vast majority (over 90 percent) of both the limited English and the English proficient adult populations did not receive public assistance in 1979. However, limited English proficient adults were 1.75 times more likely to receive public assistance than English proficient adults; but there were eleven times as many English proficient as limited English proficient adults receiving public assistance. Females in both populations were more likely to receive public assistance than males.

i. Household Type

There is little difference in household types between limited English proficient and English proficient adults. Three-quarters of both populations live in married couple households; and this household type has the lowest percentage of persons living in poverty of any household type. Female headed households with no husband present have the highest percentage of families living in poverty in both the limited English and the English proficient populations.

j. Native Born

Over one-third, or 2.3 million, of the limited English proficient adult population is native born, with a median age of 39.0 years. The largest percentage are Hispanic, most of whom are of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin. Another third are White non-Hispanic. Thirty-three percent live the South, largely in Florida and Texas.

Another 25 percent reside in the West, primarily in California, and 29 percent live in the Northeast, especially New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. An additional 13 percent live in the Midwest.

The native born limited English proficient adult population is somewhat more female than male, has somewhat higher percentages of female headed households than the limited English proficient adult population in general, has a relatively low level of education, and a comparatively high percentage of persons receiving public assistance. Almost one-third live in poverty, and close to forty percent are not in the labor force.

III. MODELS OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The purpose of this chapter is to present a framework for describing models of vocational training and other employment related services for limited English proficient adults. In developing this framework, the literature on vocational services for LEP adults was reviewed, and information on service provision was collected from officials and staff at state and local agencies which administer vocational programs.

The results of the investigation showed that vocational training for LEP adults varies considerably depending on training objectives, vocational skill area, and needs of the population served. Services may be divided into three areas or components:

- Language Component;
- Vocational Component; and
- Support Services Component.

For a vocational training program for LEP adults, the language and vocational components provide the basic elements, while the support services component provides supplementary, yet important, services to participants. The more comprehensive training programs offer services from all three components; however, many agencies offer only vocational training, and others only language instruction. Within components, agencies choose practices or activities based on program objectives, needs of participants, staff capabilities, funding levels, and similiar considerations.

Not only do agencies provide different practices and activities, but they combine them in different ways. First, sequencing of practices or activities vary. For example, across components, language instruction may precede or be concurrent with vocational training. Second, different practices or activities may be provided by a single agency or by multiple agencies. For example, language and vocational instruction both may be provided by a community college; alternatively, the community college may provide vocational training only and refer participants to adult education at the local school district for language instruction. Third, there are varying levels of coordination among practices and activities. In some

cases, the language and vocational curriculums may be tied closely together with instructors interacting regularly to coordinate their lessons. In other instances, language and vocational instruction is provided completely independently of each other.

There are no uniform standards for specific practices and activities relative to hours of instruction, teacher credentials, student-teacher ratios, and the like. These standards depend on training objectives, the target population, the needs of the community, the local employment situation, employer needs, available funding, and the interests of officials and staff members of local educational and job training agencies.

The three major components of vocational services are illustrated in the exhibit on the following page, along with individual practices or approaches which may be implemented within each. The components and the individual practices are described below.

A. Language Component

The language component of a vocational training program for limited English proficient adults may consist of one or more of the following practices:

- English as a Second Language (ESL);
- Pre-Employment Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL); or
- Occupation-Specific VESL.

These practices are not mutually exclusive and may overlap to some extent. Programs may provide one or more of these practices. Further, if more than one is taught, they most likely are not equally emphasized. One may be the primary focus, with the other(s) of secondary importance, depending on overall program objectives.

1. English as a Second Language (ESL)

English as a Second Language is a broad, generic term for the practice of teaching English to individuals who were raised in homes in which other languages were spoken. ESL encompasses both speaking and reading

MODELS OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND OTHER JOB-RELATED SERVICES FOR LEP ADULTS

Language Component

- ESL
- Pre-Employment VESL
- Occupation-Specific VESL

Vocational Component

- All-English Vocational Training without special language support
- All-English Vocational Training with special language support:
  - (a) Bilingual aide/tutor
  - (b) Monolingual English-speaking aide/tutor
  - (c) Pairing with bilingual participant
  - (d) Pairing with monolingual English speaking participant
  - (e) Learning center for individualized instruction
- Bilingual Vocational Training
- On the Job Training

Support Services Component

- Assessment and Screening
- Basic Skills
- Child Care
- Transportation
- Counseling
- Job Development and Placement
- Other Social and Health Services

instruction and utilizes a range of different instructional approaches. Frequently, instructors adopt an eclectic approach to instruction to meet the needs of the students in their classroom. Thus, the nature of the instruction depends on the needs of the target group and their level of English proficiency. Instructional objectives may range from very basic English language skills to fairly high proficiency levels.

2. **Pre-Employment Vocational English as a Second Language**

Pre-employment VESL is a special type of ESL program designed specifically to address the needs of individuals for minimum competency in English relative to obtaining entry-level employment. This includes job-hunting skills such as reading classified advertisements, calling for an interview appointment, filling out a job application, and interviewing skills.

3. **Occupation-Specific Vocational English as a Second Language**

The purpose of occupation-specific VESL is to provide job-specific language instruction in a given vocational area. The focus of this instruction is on the vocabulary and grammar of a specific occupation or job. Occupation-specific VESL is almost always provided in conjunction with vocational training.

B. Vocational Component

Vocational training for LEP adults may be categorized according to the following practices or approaches:

- All-English Vocational Training Without Special Language Support;
- All-English Vocational Training With Special Language Support consisting of one or more of the following:

  a) Bilingual aide,
  b) Monolingual English-speaking aide,
  c) Pairing with bilingual participant,
  d) Pairing with monolingual English-speaking participant,
  e) Learning center for individualized instruction;

- Bilingual Vocational Training; and
- On-the-Job Training.

1. **All-English Vocational Training Without Special Language Support**

This practice is actually regular vocational education designed for the general population. No special services are employed for the LEP adult, and no special materials are available. Limited English proficient adults who apply for entry to these programs frequently are directed to ESL programs offered by the sponsoring agency or by another agency. They must meet certain language criteria before they are accepted into vocational training.

2. **All-English Vocational Training With Special Language Support**

This practice consists of regular vocational education designed for the general population, but with special accommodations made to help the LEP participant. Special services may include a bilingual or monolingual English speaking aide in the classroom to help supplement and clarify the instruction provided by the English-speaking instructor. This allows for more individualized instruction for the LEP student than the regular student would receive. Another approach is to pair the LEP student with another student who is bilingual or perhaps monolingual English speaking. In this case, the bilingual helper can translate and clarify the instructor's lessons and other material for the LEP student; the monolingual English speaking helper can work one-on-one with the LEP student and provide individualized attention to that individual which a single instructor cannot. In addition to classroom aides or pairing of students, other special services include the use of tutors to provide extra individualized instruction, and materials translated into the students' native language.

Another special service provided by some programs is a learning or resource center for individualized instruction. This center allows students to seek remedial help via programmed instructional materials, sometimes computer assisted and sometimes using audio-visual aids. The learning center is usually designed for all students who need extra help, not specifically for LEP students.

3. Bilingual Vocational Training (BVT)

Bilingual vocational training is a comprehensive program specifically designed for the LEP population. The central element of the program is the provision of vocational training using the native language initially, and transitioning to English as the participants learn the language. Because the native language is used, this approach is only appropriate for classes in which all participants speak the same native language. Special instructional materials are used, designed specifically for LEP students. Instructors are bilingual in English and the participants' native language. During the period of transition from the native language to English, both languages may be used, switching from one to the other, to clarify instruction. In some cases, however, when only monolingual English speaking instructors are available, they are paired with bilingual classroom aides.

English language training is coordinated with the vocational training. Language instruction is likely to be occupational-specific VESL, although the instruction may begin with survival-level ESL or pre-employment VESL. Support services such as recruitment and assessment, employment counseling, and job placement are also provided as part of a comprehensive BVT program.

4. On-the-Job Training

On-the-job training involves placement of an individual with an employer in the community for the purpose of learning a skill or occupation. As opposed to a classroom environment, training is provided in a work environment. Skills are learned by actual performance of a specific job, and with the specific tools and machines used for that job. On-the-job training situations are frequently established with the intention that the trainee will become a regular employee of the company which provides the training. Training may be provided by a monolingual English speaker if the trainee was enrolled in ESL or VESL prior to participation in OJT. However, some employers used bilingual foremen to train OJT participants and to supervise them after training is completed and they are hired as employees.

C. Support Services Component

Supplementary services to support the vocational and language training components may include the following:

- Assessment and Screening;
- Basic Skills;
- Child Care;
- Transportation;
- Employment Counseling;
- Job Development and Placement; and
- Other Social and Health Services.

The specific support services provided depends on a program's objectives, participants' needs, services provided by other agencies or programs in the community, and available funds. The more comprehensive and better funded programs generally provide more support services, while others provide a more limited selection.

1. Assessment and Screening

Entrance criteria are different for each program. Therefore, assessment and screening efforts vary considerably. Among the areas included in the assessment process are vocational interests and aptitudes, English and native language proficiency, and basic skills. A wide range of diagnostic instruments are used to measure these aptitudes and abilities, upon which acceptance and placement decisions are made.

2. Basic Skills

Basic skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic) is an area in which LEP adults are frequently found to require remedial help. These skills are required for success in a wide range of vocational areas, and many programs offer instruction in this area. Frequently, instruction is individualized using programmed instructional booklets or computer-assisted instruction, and is provided in an instructional or resource center designed to serve all students who require extra instruction.

3. Child Care

Some programs partially reimburse participants for child care; others provide the service directly.

4. Transportation

Some programs reimburse participants for their travel, while some others operate van pools to transport participants to the center.

5. Counseling

When counseling is offered, it is most often provided with respect to employment opportunities and vocational choice. Some programs also provide counseling relative to immigration issues, health services, public assistance, other social services, and completing financial aide forms and applications for public assistance.

6. Job Development and Placement

Many agencies have job developers on their staff who help place trainees in jobs. Generally, these are the agencies or programs which emphasize vocational training. Agencies or programs which provide ESL or VESL only (no vocational training) are less likely to provide job placement services. Since one of the important measures of the success of vocational training is job placement and job retention, job development and placement is an important service. Some agencies have staff members working full-time on this activity in order to keep in regular contact with the employers in the community so that they can match program completers with appropriate job opportunities.

Another important activity which many agencies implement along with their job placement activities is follow-up of program completers for the purpose of evaluating program success. This is done by contacting employers or the former trainees themselves by telephone or through the mail. Information is

then collected concerning job retention, increase in wages, satisfaction with training, and suggested improvements to the training program. Another advantage of contacting employers for follow up information is that it keeps the program in contact with the employers in the community for additional placement opportunities in the future.

7. Other Social and Health Services

In addition to providing counseling relative to the availability of health and social services in the community, some agencies offer these services directly.

0303y/9.88

IV. STATE AND LOCAL POLICIES AND SERVICES

The purpose of this chapter is to present the overall findings of the six case studies which were conducted to examine services and policies concerning the provision of vocational services to limited English proficient adults. The findings are discussed below under the following topic areas:

- State Policy;
- Vocational Training Services;
- Additional Needs/Gaps in Services; and
- Barriers to Extending Training.

A. State Policy

1. State agencies responsible for education and job-related training have not singled out the LEP adult population as a statewide priority over other disadvantaged groups for the provision of vocational services. On the other hand, no other group has been identified as a particular priority either. For the most part, state agencies have left the identification of priorities to local jurisdictions to meet locally determined needs. Further, the provision of special vocational services to the LEP adult population does not appear to be a state-level concern. Rather, it is thought of as a local issue to be addressed by local jurisdictions which have significant numbers of this population.

2. Federal Perkins money is available to serve a variety of disadvantaged groups, and local jurisdictions are encouraged by state education agencies to target these funds as they see fit to meet local needs. Within local jurisdictions, federal funds under the Perkins disadvantaged setaside are distributed to programs for each disadvantaged group based on the number of disadvantaged students of each type served during the previous year. Local jurisdictions can adjust how the funds are distributed by how they identify program participants. For example, an individual may be identified as a LEP adult, or alternatively, combined with other individuals, as academically disadvantaged. The latter category allows for more flexibility in funding. Thus, local jurisdictions have no incentive to identify the number of LEP adults, nor to identify the number in need of services.

3. The percentage of Perkins funds targeted at post-secondary level programs (for adults), as opposed to secondary level programs, is decided at the state level. Generally, less than half of Perkins funding is targeted at programs for adults, with the majority of the funding going to secondary level programs.

B. Vocational Training Services

1. Vocational training services for adults and out-of-school youth are readily available in most jurisdictions. However, proficiency in oral English is generally required along with basic reading, writing, and math skills. These entry criteria essentially exclude LEP adults from programs. Those LEP adults who do apply are generally referred to ESL programs and are asked to re-apply when they can meet the vocational program's entry criteria.

2. Vocational training specifically directed at LEP adults, which combine training in occupational and language skills, are less frequently available. Generally, they are administered by an agency or organization which has special interests in serving that population, such as a refugee program or community-based organization with ties to a specific ethnic group. Agencies or organizations which serve the general population, such as community colleges and JTPA-funded agencies, are less likely to offer vocational services specifically targeted at the LEP population, and generally require applicants to demonstrate English language proficiency before they can enter a vocational program.

3. The most frequent service offered and utilized by LEP adults is ESL. This is generally provided by adult education programs sponsored by a local school district. Community colleges and community-based organizations also provide significant amounts of ESL instruction.

4. Respondents indicated that the use of a single model of vocational training for LEP adults across an entire state is inappropriate. Training services must be designed to meet local needs in terms of the specific LEP group, the mix of LEP groups, and the job market of the area. For example, an instructional approach for a class of Spanish-speaking adults would not

necessarily be appropriate for a class containing individuals with different native languages. Training must be designed to meet a specific situation and target group.

5. JTPA programs are directed at the general population and were hardly ever found to target the LEP adult population. Most programs refer LEP adults to ESL programs at the local school district and suggest people re-apply after they learn English. Some JTPA programs in large cities with a large LEP population place LEP individuals for on-the-job training with employers who do not require English proficiency.

6. Community colleges are mainly interested in serving individuals who enroll in degree and certificate programs. Programs for special population groups (such as LEP adults) which do not fall into these areas are not a focus of community colleges.

C. **Additional Needs/Gaps in Services Identified By Local Providers**

1. LEP adults have multiple barriers to employment and, therefore, multiple needs.

2. LEP adults frequently lack basic reading, writing and math skills. Agencies and programs need to ensure that individuals acquire these skills prior to or concurrent with vocational training. Basic skills can be taught by the vocational program, or referrals can be made to other agencies or programs.

3. Other skills which are needed by LEP adults are job search skills, orientation towards the workplace, and work-related behavior expected in our society. In addition to occupational skills, LEP adults need to be made aware of what is expected of them on the job (attendance, punctuality, etc.). An orientation to these behavior needs to be part of the vocational curriculum for LEP adults.

4. Child care and transportation services are two support services needed by LEP adults in order to permit them to enroll and stay enrolled in vocational training.

D. Barriers to Extending Training

1. A major problem concerning the provision of services is that precise information on the size of the LEP adult population in a state or local jurisdiction is rarely known. There are no standardized methods or procedures in place for identifying and counting these individuals. Therefore, decision-makers do not have accurate information concerning the extent of the need which may exist in their state or community.

2. Finding bilingual instructors for a wide range of language groups who are qualified to provide vocational training in specific occupational areas is difficult. Such individuals are highly desired by industry, and therefore are difficult to recruit for relatively low-paying instructional positions at community colleges and other training organizations.

3. There do not appear to be strong advocacy and leadership groups lobbying for increased and improved vocational training services for LEP adults. Leaders from different ethnic groups rarely work together to push for services. The result is that these groups constitute competing forces rather than a unified one calling for increased services.

4. There appears to be very little coordination and joint planning among state agencies concerning vocational training for LEP adults. An effort to develop state working teams to focus on planning and delivery of these services was generally unsuccessful since agencies were reluctant to provide monetary support to the endeavor in order to continue the effort past its initial year.

5. Federal funding requiring a state or local match is often a problem for states or local jurisdictions. It was reported that agencies frequently cannot afford to match federal funds, preventing them from applying for funding.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major conclusions of this study are that (1) the number of LEP adults who lack the skills to compete in the future U.S. labor market is increasing; (2) neither the federal nor state governments are adequately addressing this issue; and (3) the growing LEP adult population is impacting most heavily on selected urban areas and rural agricultural areas in certain parts of the country.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that immigrants will comprise 23 percent of the change in the labor force between 1986 and 2000. The ability of LEP adults to assimilate into the U.S. economy will depend on their English proficiency, job skills, and geographic location. The research evidence indicates that close to 30 percent of the LEP adult population will be living in poverty by 1990, and this percentage could increase if the economy slows and growth in unskilled and low skilled jobs decreases.

A large proportion of the LEP adult population will not only need English language training and job skills training, but will also need employment related services such as basic skills education, high school equivalency, child care, and transportation before they can become self-sufficient in the future U.S. labor market. These conclusions are based on the downward shift in education and occupational skills among recent immigrants that is expected to continue, the anticipated slowing of the economy, and projected changes in the labor market that favor better educated and skilled persons.

The current situation is the direct result of federal policy on immigration. However, federal policy does not adequately address the needs of the increasing numbers of new immigrants who require assistance to adjust to the U.S. economy. State governments typically do not single out LEP adults from other special needs populations. Rather, decision-making regarding services to LEP adults is left to local governments, where state and local officials agree it belongs; however, funds for these services are limited. Local communities experience the full impact of LEP adult needs for employment training and related services because this population is so heavily concentrated and is increasing in certain geographical areas of the country.

The main purpose of this chapter is to present recommendations for future policy concerning vocational education for LEP adults. These recommendations and a rationale for each are presented below. The recommendations cover a broad range of topics which, hopefully, can be used to progress towards raising awareness, increasing the knowledge base, and coordinating services for LEP adults.

A. Federal Role

Recommendation 1

A special funding category within federal vocational education legislation is needed to specifically target LEP adults.

Rationale

Federal funding is necessary and appropriate since federal policy on refugees and legal and illegal immigration has a primary impact on the size and composition of this population. Therefore, the responsibility for serving this population should not be entirely left to the states and local communities. Further, job training programs under JTPA do not appear to adequately serve this population. A special funding category to target LEP adults is necessary since the inclusion of this population as part of the disadvantaged category under Title II of the Perkins Act of 1984 has resulted in this population being inadequately served.

B. Services Needed

Recommendation 2

Limited English proficient adults should be encouraged and assisted to learn English as soon as possible upon arrival in this country.

Rationale

Lack of English proficiency is a barrier to economic assimilation for LEP adults. Several studies indicate that if a LEP adult does not learn English

within approximately ten years after arriving in this country, the probability that the person will ever become English proficient rapidly decreases.

Recommendation 3

A coordinated program of English language training, vocational training, and support services is needed to adequately serve the LEP adult population. This does not mean that all services need to be provided by a single agency; but a wide array of services need to be made available in a coordinated and systematic manner to meet the needs of this population.

Rationale

Generally, there are a number of employment training and related services in most communities, but they are not adequately serving LEP adults. Part of the problem is the lack of a systematic approach to serving this population and a lack of understanding of their needs.

Services for LEP adults should be planned and coordinated among agencies to avoid duplication and to maximize cost-effectiveness. Large cities such as New York City, Los Angeles, Miami, and Chicago should be divided into service delivery areas so that services can be readily accessible in neighborhoods with high concentrations of low income LEP adults. If at all possible, planning and coordination should be done through existing community planning and coordinating groups rather than forming additional groups for this purpose.

Recommendation 4

Services should include English language training, basic skills instruction, work literacy*, and occupational skills training. All of these should be available for program participants and provided based on their individual

*Job search and interviewing skills, workplace behaviors, etc.

needs. Support services should include individual assessment of needs; day care, transportation, and job placement assistance. Vocational training should be provided in occupational areas in which jobs are available so that completers will be able to find appropriate jobs.

Rationale

LEP adults have a range of job readiness attributes depending, among other things, on their educational level, U.S. specific job skills, and experience. At one end of the continuum, a person may have all of these attributes and only require ESL, whereas a person at the other end may require multiple services over a longer period of time, and there will be several variations of needs in between. Thus, both short-term and long-term employment training and related services should be available for LEP adults, particularly in areas with high concentrations of low income language minorities.

Particular attention should be given to LEP adults who need long-term training and assistance. These persons often are not served because job training programs are evaluated by the number of job placements, which encourages "creaming." Those in need of long-term assistance will require goal oriented coordination of multiple services.

Recommendation 5

Each job training program should have a career development component and a component for coordinating support services with other agencies for this purpose.

Rationale

Many LEP adults are now being trained for low level, dead-end jobs based on the rationale that they need jobs immediately and these jobs are available. Under some circumstances, this approach is understandable. In addition, however, LEP adults should be given some guidance on how they can improve their skills to increase their future employment potential.

Some LEP adults will need additional services to advance during their working lives. Job training programs should establish referral networks with other agencies in the community and provide guidance to program participants in how these community resources can be used for career development.

Recommendation 6

Provisions should be made for training bilingual tutors and bilingual teacher aides for vocational classrooms.

Rationale

There is a serious shortage of bilingual vocational education teachers, bilingual tutors, and bilingual teachers aides. Since training teachers is costly and time-consuming, the use of bilingual tutors and bilingual aides is a cost-effective alternative that could help meet this need.

Recommendation 7

Provisions should be made for developing and disseminating materials to local communities and programs on how to estimate the number of LEP adults in need of employment training and how to assess individual LEP adult needs.

Rationale

Communities need some guidance in estimating the number of LEP adults requiring employment training. This has not been done to date because of a lack of methodology. However, even an estimate based on the percentage of language minorities below 1.25 times the poverty level who are LEP adults would be a start. Adjustments could be made based on the number of LEP students in the schools and other relevant local data.

Similarly, programs lack tools for assessing English proficiency, basic skills, and occupational aptitutes of LEP adults . Some materials have been developed in this area, but they need to be packaged and disseminated, and others may need to be developed.

C. Populations and Geographic Areas to Target

Recommendation 8

Resources should be targeted to areas with the highest concentrations of low income language minorities, most of whom will be in urban areas in selected states. Additionally, some resources should be made available for LEP adults in non-urban areas.

Rationale

Almost 90 percent of the LEP adults live in urban areas, and they are concentrated in certain "gateway" cities where they arrived. However, there are some LEP adults in need of services residing in non-urban areas, including settled-out migrant farmworkers, the young adult children of migrant farmworkers, and Native Americans.

Recommendation 9

LEP adults in need of employment who are residing in areas with high unemployment rates or low wages should be given information and guidance so they can relocate to other areas of the country where job opportunities and wages are better.

Rationale

Many LEP adults are locked in areas with poor job opportunities due to their lack of English proficiency and lack of information on job opportunities in other parts of the country. Relocation should be presented as an option, and guidance should be given on how relocation can realistically and successfully be accomplished.

Recommendation 10

LEP adults in need of employment who are residing in ethnic enclaves should be encouraged and assisted in seeking employment opportunities in the larger society.

Rationale

There are a number of less educated, low skilled LEP adults living in ethnic enclaves. Some are not in the labor force; others are working in low wage jobs. Many are women, and some are native born LEP adults. Along with English language and job training, these people should be encouraged and assisted in seeking better employment opportunities in the larger society.

Recommendation 11

Services should be targeted to LEP persons between the ages of 16 to 35, especially school drop-outs.

Rationale

Over half of the LEP adults living below 1.25 times the poverty level are between the ages of 16 and 35. Many are school drop-outs. Besides ESL and job training, some may need basic skills, high school equivalency, and support services to improve their employment potential. Targeting this age group is a worthwhile effort, since they have a number of working years ahead.

Recommendation 12

Services should be targeted to LEP women, especially female household heads.

Rationale

LEP women have much lower labor force participation rates than either LEP men or English proficient women. Also, LEP families have lower incomes than English proficient families. One way to increase family income is to increase the number of wage earners. Additionally, there are some LEP single parents who are not self-sufficient. They need training for jobs that will help them become independent.

Recommendation 13

Services should be available for all low income LEP adults. But, the majority of those in need of services will be Hispanic; and among Hispanics, the largest number in need of services will be of Mexican or Puerto Rican origin.

Rationale

The vast majority of LEP adults in need of services will be Hispanic. Others will be from a mix of language minorities. The proportion of each language minority below 1.25 times the poverty level in the population should be considered in designing programs and materials and training vocational education teachers for LEP adults.

Recommendation 14

Programs should be targeted first to LEP adults below 1.25 times the poverty level, then to those between 1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level.

Rationale

Persons most in need of assistance are those below 1.25 times the poverty level. They are the members of our society who are most at risk. Those in the 1.25 to 1.99 category above poverty are also in a high risk group where any downturn in the economy or personal circumstances could jeopardize their economic well-being. LEP adults in need of services within these two poverty categories will include those not in the labor force (e.g., discouraged workers, new entries, and re-entries), involuntary part-time workers, displaced workers (who may need retraining), unemployed persons, and those earning low wages.

Recommendation 15

LEP adults and youth who are incarcerated should continue to be served by federal vocational education funds.

Rationale

There are a number of LEP youth (ages 16-20) and adults who are incarcerated, especially in localities where there are high concentrations of language minorities. Besides being limited English proficient, many have severe educational deficiencies and no job skills.

D. Distribution of Funds

Recommendation 16

Funding of services for LEP adults should be directed at communities with large numbers of LEP adults in need of services, as defined by poverty status or income data. To implement this, states and local jurisdictions should be required to estimate the size of their LEP adult population, and the number of this population in need of vocatonal training and employment-related services. States and local communities should be monitored to ensure that LEP adults are adequately served.

Rationale

Since low income LEP adults are concentrated in certain areas of the country, resources should be targeted to those areas rather than distributed throughout the fifty states.

Resources for LEP adult employment training should be distributed based on the proportion of each language minority population below 1.25 times the poverty level in a given geographic location, or an equivalent criterion.

E. Eligibility

Recommendation 17

Priority for job training should be given first to LEP adults whose pretransfer income is below 1.25 times the poverty level, then to LEP adults whose pretransfer income is between 1.25 and 1.99 times the poverty level.

Rationale

As previously stated, LEP adults below 1.25 times the poverty level are essentially living in poverty, and many of those living between 1.25 and 1.99 have marginal incomes and employment.

Recommendation 18

Programs serving LEP adults should be open to citizens and nationals of the United States, lawfully admitted permanent resident aliens, lawfully admitted refugees and parolees, and other individuals authorized by the Attorney General to work in the United States.

Rationale

It should be made clear that job training programs for LEP adults are available to all otherwise eligible legal residents of the United States.

****

In summary, we project that a broad range of employment training and related services will be needed to assist the less educated and less skilled LEP adults in reaching and maintaining economic independence. These services should be funded by the federal government and by other public and private sources, but services for LEP adults need to be coordinated at the local level.